UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,610	12/26/2001	Arei Kobayashi	011736	4491

23850 7590 04/17/2006

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/025,610	KOBAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 11-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 11-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to Applicant's Amendments and Remarks filed on 1/26/2006.

2. Claims 1-8 and 11-14 have been considered. Claims 1, 5, and 13 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,574, in view of Dean et al. ("Dean"), U.S. Patent No. 2002/0152244, in further view of Martin et al., "WAP

Binary XML Content Format", W3C Note, June 24, 1999, pgs. 1-22 ("W3C-A"), in further view of James Clark, "Associating Stylesheets with XML Documents", W3C Proposed Recommendation, April 28, 1999, pgs. 1-4 ("W3C-B").

Regarding independent claim 1:

➢ *A computer-implemented executable by computers and embedded in computer readable media for code processing of document data* (see Murashita Abstract) *comprising the steps of:*

➢ *encoding, at a sending side, a document data written in a description language of an extensible text format to a code data containing logical structure of elements, based on a first code-translation table*

Murashita discloses the compression/decompression of tags in markup documents by creating a tag code/decode table based on the encoding of tags in a DTD included in documents (see Title and col. 14, lines 46-54 → Method encodes and compresses extensible text format into code data. See also col. 15, lines 26-38 *et seq.* → i.e., "tag code table").

➢ *transmitting said code data from the sending side to a receiving side* (see Murashita - col. 14 lines 50-54).

➢ *decoding, at the receiving side, said code data to the document data based on a second code-translation table*

Murashita discloses a decompressing method wherein code data is decoded based on a second code-translation table. (see Fig. 4 and col. 16 lines 62-67 *et seq.*).

➢ *each of said first and second code-translation tables defining a code length and a code assigned to items of an element name*

Murashita discloses tag code/decode tables defining the code length and a code assigned to items of an element name (see col. 4, lines 51-56; col. 21, lines 53 *et seq.*).

Murashita does not explicitly disclose *a code-translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format.*

However, Dean discloses a lookup table (i.e., which can store all translations of document elements, etc.) written in a description language of an extensible text format (see para [0157]).

Since the references are from the same field of endeavor (namely XML encoding), the motivational purpose of using XML on networks such as the World Wide Web and fast access for publishing documents for different device types such as computers, PDAs, and cell phones (see para [0004]) as disclosed by Dean would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Murashita. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Murashita with the teachings of Dean to writing translation tables in an extensible text format.

Murashita, in view of Dean, does not explicitly disclose *a variable-declaration data type of an element value for said element name, an attribute name designated in*

said element name, a variable-declaration data type of an attribute value for said attribute name, based on logical structure of elements, and defining a code length and a code assigned to designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name.

However, W3C-A discloses said translation table (see pg. 9 – 3rd paragraph et seq. → i.e. "code pages") defining a code length and a code (see bottom of pg. 10 et seq.) assigned to items of an element name, a variable-declaration data type of an element value for said element name (see pg. 7 – 1st paragraph and pg. 15), an attribute name designated in said element name, a variable-declaration data type of an attribute value for said attribute name, based on logical structure of elements (see pg. 11), and defining a code length and a code assigned to designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name (see pg. 16 – 1st paragraph; see also examples on pgs. 18-22).

Since the references are from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of defining a compact binary representation of XML to reduce the transmission size of XML documents while allowing more effective use of XML data on narrowband communication channels with no loss of functionality or semantic information (see pg. 2 –1st paragraph) as disclosed by W3C-A would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Murashita, in view of Dean. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Murashita, in view of Dean, with the teachings of W3C-A.

Murashita, in view of Dean and W3C-A, do not explicitly disclose *defining link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure*. However, W3C-B discloses that Link headers may be used with XML documents to specify links between code-translation tables (i.e., XSL stylesheets) (see pg. 3 – 3rd paragraph *et seq.*)

Since the references are from the same field of endeavor, the motivational purpose of a more efficient and faster method of associating extensible documents by defining instructions in a document header file as disclosed by W3C-B would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Murashita, in view of Dean and W3C-A. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Murashita, in view of Dean and W3C-A, with the teachings of W3C-B.

Independent claims 5 and 13 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding claims 2 and 6, Murashita, in view of Dean, W3C-A, and W3C-B, disclose wherein the items defined in the second code-translation table used in said decoding step are a subset of the items defined in the first code-translation table used in said encoding step (see Murashita col. 17, lines 1-12; col. 23, lines 60-67. The items

defined in the decoding step are a set whose members are members of the encoding step set).

Regarding claims 3, 7, and 14, Murashita, in view of Dean, W3C-A, and W3C-B, disclose wherein said encoding step includes encoding only the items that are defined in the first code-translation table or said other code translation tables, and skipping, without encoding, other items that are not defined in said first code-translation table not said other code-translation table (see Murashita col. 3, lines 25-33. The system processes the code defined in the document instance on the basis of the tag code table (i.e. translation table")).

Regarding claims 4 and 8, Murashita, in view of Dean, W3C-A, and W3C-B, disclose wherein said encoding step includes adding data indicating lengths occupied by the respective items to the codes corresponding the respective items, and wherein said decoding step includes skipping, without decoding, the codes of the lengths corresponding to the items that are not defined in said second-code translation table nor said other code-translation table (see Murashita col. 23, lines 1-4; col. 24, lines 18-67 *et seq.*, and col. 30 lines 10-47).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Murashita, in view of Dean, W3C-A, and W3C-B, disclose the method and system of decoding, at the receiving side, code data to the document data based on a second code-translation table as discussed above in the rejection of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Murashita discloses transmitting said code data from a sending side over a network to a plurality of network locations to a receiving side (see Murashita - col. 14 lines 50-54; col. 16 lines 26-30). Murashita also discloses that each receiving side creates its own decode translation table which decompresses the transmitted code data from the sending side based on the receiving side's own third code-translation table (see Fig. 4 and col. 16 lines 62-67 *et seq.*).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's outstanding arguments with respect the newly amended subject matter (i.e., feature "item 2" as labeled in Applicant's Remarks – pg. 10, last paragraph *et seq.*) filed on 1/26/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The new grounds of rejection include the addition of the W3C-B reference (James Clark, "Associating Stylesheets with XML Documents", W3C Proposed Recommendation, April 28, 1999, pgs. 1-4) which is being relied upon for teaching the

newly added limitation, "*defining link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure*".

Applicant further contends that "the tag document, the tag code table and the tag decode table in Murashita are written in SGML that is not extensible like HTML" and therefore does not teach the features of "item 1" (as labeled by Applicant in Remarks – pg. 10, last paragraph *et seq.*).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. A careful examination of the present invention's background art section (Applicant's Specification – pg. 2, last paragraph) shows that markup languages of extensible text format include SGML (as disclosed in Murashita) and XML. Conversely, HTML is not an extensible text format because it lacks the ability to be modified by changing or adding features (i.e., tags) that both SGML and XML possess.

Therefore, Murashita does indeed disclose an extensible text formatted (SGML) tag document and tag code/decode table, and therefore, discloses the features of "item 1" (Applicant's Specification – pg. 2, last paragraph) as discussed above in the rejection of independent claim 1. The Dean reference was added merely to disclose that a translation table could also be written XML format as well (see Dean - para [0157]). The W3C-A reference was not relied upon for teaching said feature "item 1" as Applicant implies.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB
4/12/06

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100